



Columbia University  
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



THE SELIGMAN LIBRARY OF ECONOMICS

PURCHASED BY THE UNIVERSITY

1929

BB

1895

THREE YEARS' WORK  
ON THE  
LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.



A Letter to the Electors of Deptford

—BY—

**SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B.,**

*Chairman of the Technical Education Board.*



Seliman  
1895E  
P267

# THE WORK

OF THE

## LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL:

A LETTER TO THE ELECTORS OF DEPTFORD

BY

**SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B.,**

ONE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPTFORD ON THE COUNCIL, AND

CHAIRMAN OF THE TECHNICAL EDUCATION BOARD.\*

TO THE ELECTORS OF DEPTFORD,

Three years ago you chose me, together with Mr. Keylock, to represent Deptford on the London County Council. The time is close at hand when you will again have to choose your representatives, and I shall then ask you to renew your confidence in me and let me continue

\* (Member of the Appeal Committee, 1892-3; Establishment Committee, 1892-3; Finance Committee, 1893-5; General Purposes Committee, 1892-5; Local Government and Taxation Committee, 1892-5; (Vice-Chairman, 1892-4); Parliamentary Committee, 1892-5; Public Health and Housing Committee, 1892-3; Rivers Committee, 1894-5; Water Committee, 1892-5; and of the Special Committees on London Government, 1894-5; Technical Education (Chairman), 1892-3; and Thames Conservancy, 1893-4; Chairman of the Technical Education Board, 1893-5).

the work which you gave me to do. But before we actually come to the excitement of the election contest, I want to report to you what kind of work it is that the Council has been doing, so that you may the better realise how far your representatives have deserved the confidence which you placed in them.

And, first, let me say a word as to the amount of time that it takes to be a County Councillor. During the past three years I have spent nearly every afternoon, except Saturdays, on the Council's business, and not unfrequently a part of the morning also. I must have attended between 800 and 1,000 meetings of one sort or another. With the exception of the brief holiday times, I do not think I have ever got off with less than 20 hours Council work in a week, whilst it has sometimes run to twice that amount. We have a very proper rule forbidding both the representatives of a constituency to serve on the same committee. I have, therefore, necessarily left to my colleague, Mr. Keylock, with whom I have always acted harmoniously, the important subjects of Parks and Asylums. The committees on which I have myself served are stated on the first page.

Probably most of you have read from time to time the newspaper reports of the Council's work, but it unfortunately happens that, under the conditions of newspaper existence, the journalist's account of the Council's proceedings is almost certain to give a false view of its activity. A tart epigram by John Burns, or a reckless accusation against the Fire Brigade or Works Committee, makes better "copy" than the dry record of administrative work presented week by week, to be, in most cases, absolutely ignored by the reporters.

Let us take, as a sample, the proceedings of a single week. The reader of the *Times* or the *Daily Chronicle* (the daily papers giving the fullest reports of the Council) had his attention drawn to between six and nine points which cropped up at the Tuesday meeting. The agenda-paper for that meeting, which is about of average length, is now before me. It consists of thirty-one pages of foolscap print, containing the recommendations of twenty-eight committees, upon which the Council is invited to pass



no fewer than 128 separate resolutions. These vary in importance from financial transactions involving hundreds of thousands of pounds, or issues of policy affecting a whole department, down to the appointment of an extra clerk or the sanctioning of a sky-sign. They concern every branch of London's municipal government, from water-supply to weights and measures, from tunnelling the Thames to technical education, from cricket-pitches to taxation. On all these subjects, moreover, there are numerous paragraphs reporting the progress of works already ordered by the Council, or describing action taken as to which no resolution is required.

### “London Week by Week.”

This survey of “London Week by Week” it is, literally as long as one volume of an ordinary novel, which is delivered to every Councillor on Saturday night, and which forms the business of the ensuing Tuesday's meeting. Critics appalled at the length of the agenda have sometimes suggested that the Council keeps too much in its own hands, and, by not delegating greater powers to its committees, compels much of its work to be done twice over. This, however, is not the fact. When a committee is in the hands of a competent chairman and enjoys the confidence of the Council, its work is habitually left unchallenged, and it often happens that, for many weeks in succession, not a single criticism or objection is made about it in Council. When, however, a committee elects an injudicious chairman, or commits itself in any way—when, indeed, anything in its department goes wrong from any cause whatsoever—a feeling of uneasiness spreads among the other members of the Council. Every line of the reports of that committee is then scrutinised, and critics of all kinds, friendly or hostile, spring to their feet on Tuesday afternoon. Possibly the wisest go quietly to the committee itself and get their criticisms made where they can be properly sifted and considered. But there are always enough of those who prefer to move amendments to specific recommendations, even when their amendments express rather their general distrust of the committee's wisdom than any reasoned



dissent from the particular proposal. Hence it is not only the newspaper reports of the Council's proceedings that are misleading. Even the visitor in the Strangers' Gallery who listens to the debates is apt to carry away an altogether false impression unless he studies the agenda-paper more than the speeches. He will hear nothing whatever about the nineteen-twentieths of the work which is progressing so smoothly and so successfully that even the most carping critics of the Opposition Party can find nothing to say about it. Nearly the whole meeting, on the other hand, will be taken up with the tiny fraction momentarily labouring with some of the manifold difficulties which beset the reformer's path.

### How the County Council does its work.

But the weekly public meeting of the Council comprises, it need scarcely be said, only a small part of its work. To prepare the weekly agenda there are, on an average, forty meetings of committees or sub-committees filling up every hour of the daytime, from ten or eleven on Monday morning to five or six on Friday evening, and often terminating with a "view" or inspection of a park, a sewer, or a slaughter-house on Saturday morning. I need hardly remind you that a member who does not diligently attend his committee meetings is of practically no use, even if he does make speeches on Tuesday afternoons.

The work done by these committees falls into two classes. Whole sections of administration, indeed, such as asylums, industrial schools, and technical education, are delegated *en bloc* to particular committees, and are heard of in Council only by quarterly or annual reports, which usually go through without a single word of comment. Even where no such express and complete delegation has taken place, the great bulk of the work of administration goes on quietly in the committee room, and is never heard of outside. The Fire Brigade Committee, for instance, has a brief report in the Council's agenda every week, with perhaps a dozen proposals of one kind or another. But these are merely the residuum out of a committee agenda which habitually contains over a hundred separate items, nearly all of which the committee

decides on its own responsibility. For the week to which I am referring, when 128 resolutions were submitted to the Council, no fewer than 900 separate items came before committees and sub-committees, who spent, in the aggregate, over 60 hours in dealing with this business. It is, I suppose, inevitable that these 900 items dealt with in committee; the thirty-one pages of agenda containing 128 proposals laid before the Council; and the 60 hours spent during the week in the steady grind of the committee-room, should make far less impression on the mind of the average citizen than the half-a-dozen speeches, often on insignificant details, which are reported on the Tuesday afternoon. Yet it is not on those speeches, but on the unseen and unrecorded work which I have described, that the good government of London depends.

### **The Management of the Asylums.**

The very multifariousness of the Council's work makes any exposition of it within the limits of a letter an almost impossible task. There is no literary artifice by which the reader can be given, for instance, any idea of the patient, silent devotion of the Asylums Committee, which never gets into the papers at all. The annual report of this committee, one of the most important of all, makes, by itself, a volume of 147 foolscap pages, in which are summarised the results of 181 sittings, of ten distinct sub-committees, mostly meeting at the several asylums. Week after week the members of these sub-committees journey out to Cane Hill or Claybury, Hanwell or Banstead, to go through the thousand-and-one details involved in the management of five colossal institutions, the admission of over 3,000 lunatics every year (of whom one or two come from Deptford every week), the careful scrutiny of those fit to be restored to the world, the vigilant investigation of every complaint or accident.

Duties of similar, though less onerous character, fall upon the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Committee, which conducts schools at Feltham and Maybury, where 600 boys, rescued from premature vice or crime, are boarded, lodged, clothed, educated and started out in the world. Ten or a dozen of these boys belong to Deptford.

Here, again, the committee is practically supreme, it being the rarest possible occurrence for even a question to be asked in Council as to their patiently-laborious work.

### The Prohibition of Slum-making.

No less difficult is it to convey to the average citizen any conception of the enormous amount and importance of the work done by the Building Act Committee. It is no exaggeration to say that it is to the past neglect in this department, more than to any other cause, that we owe the existence of London's slums and rookeries, with all their evil outcome of intemperance, disease and crime. London has already spent millions in clearing out the worst of these plague-spots. But until the other day slum-making was still permitted by the law, as we know to our cost in Deptford with regard to some of the narrow passages off the High Street and elsewhere. Under the vigilant scrutiny of the Building Act Committee, with its weekly agenda containing over a hundred separate cases, an ever-tighter grasp is being kept on the jerry-builder and the house-farmer. And during the session of 1894, with a dead-lift effort that hardly anyone appreciates, the Council carried through Parliament its long-desired new Building Act, which, though sadly weakened in committee, constitutes one of the most important triumphs for London's progress that this generation has seen. I venture to say that if the Council had won no other victory against those who take advantage of London's weakness and London's poverty than this new Building Act, it would have amply deserved the gratitude of London's citizens.

### Re-housing London's Poor.

Equal gratitude is due to the Public Health and Housing Committee for its unceasing, patient struggle to deal with the slums which past neglect has created. With 386,973 persons registered at the census as living in one-roomed homes, and no fewer than 828,941 in the officially recognised overcrowded condition of two or more to a room, with over 30,000 men and women nightly destitute



of any other abode than the common lodging house or the casual ward, the problem of re-housing London's poor is the most gigantic that the world has ever seen. But a valiant effort has been made. The Council's common lodging house at Shelton Street, Drury Lane, has become a model for the world, and there will shortly be another established in Deptford itself. Whole colonies of working-class dwellings are rising up in Bethnal Green and elsewhere, whilst ten acres of the Millbank Prison site have been secured for the same purpose. Here in Deptford the Hughes Fields area is rapidly getting covered with healthy homes, whilst the horrid Mill Lane tenements are at last closed and on the point of being replaced by decent places for men and women to live in. Still greater triumphs, which can never be recounted, have been won in the improvement of sanitary administration all over London. Here the Council has no direct power, but, by quietly and persistently "pegging away" at the vestries, the standard of sanitation in every corner of London has, in the last five years, been considerably raised. Deptford is one of the districts which has received special attention, and it is satisfactory to find from the Medical Officer's report that, whilst much still remains to be done, an attempt has been made to deal with the most serious deficiencies. Two pieces of statistical evidence are typical of much that is incapable of reduction to figures. The enforcement of the public health laws in a crowded city depends, in the main, on the number of sanitary inspectors. These officers are appointed by the parochial authorities. When the Council came into existence, there were, in all London, only about 100 such inspectors. Under the Council's patient pressure the number has been doubled, and to-day there are 219 at work. No less important is the provision of a constant water supply, instead of an intermittently filled and usually foul cistern. In March, 1889, only 423,567 houses out of 748,773 in the Metropolitan water companies' districts enjoyed this boon. In March last the number had risen to 613,187. Of all the houses in London 78·7 per cent. are now on constant supply, over 100,000 having been added in the past three years.

## A House and a Garden of his own for the London Workman.

But I do not myself believe that we shall ever solve the problem of the decent housing of the London poor, or succeed in getting a really healthy city until there are better and cheaper means of communication between the centre and the suburbs. I cannot regard as satisfactory the great blocks of dwellings in which the wage-earners must live, if they are to live in the centre of London at all. I want to spread the population so that each family may have a little house and garden of its own. We have made the first step to this by deciding to take over the Tramways. The Moderate Party declared that this was sheer plunder of the shareholders. But even the House of Lords decided against them. This action of the Progressive Party has put at least a million pounds sterling into the pocket of the London ratepayer, which the Moderates tried hard to present, as a free gift, to the tramway shareholders. But I am even more interested in it from the point of view of its enabling the Council, by-and-by, so to control and extend the tramway service as to make it much more easy than it now is for men and women to live in the open suburbs.

### Parks Committee.

The most popular of all the departments of the Council's work is undoubtedly that of the Parks Committee, on which Mr. Keylock has served. In no department is the comparison with the work of the Metropolitan Board of Works more striking. The following interesting statistics show that during the five and three-quarter years of the Council's administration, a new open space has been secured, on an average, every two months. Every week that the Council has lived it has added between three and four acres to London's breathing-grounds and playing-fields.

*London's Open Spaces under the Metropolitan Board of Works.*

Year ending 31st Dec.	Number of separate Open Spaces.		Acreage.		Annual Expenditure.		Permanent Out-door Staff.	
1884*	31	5	1808	436	£ 21,851	£ 18,301	95	122
1885*	2	5	1834	436	23,222	18,301	100	122
1886*	33	5	1856	436	17,573	18,301	100	122
1887	42		2,506		40,305		238	
1888	43		2,578		42,396		278	
Total in- crease in four years (not count- ing) the p a r k s transferr'd in 1877 ..	7		334		2,244		61	

\*The five parks transferred from the Office of Works in 1887 are separately stated for 1884-86.

*London's Open Spaces under the County Council.*

Year ending 31st March.	Number of separate Open Spaces.		Acreage.		Annual Expenditure.		Permanent Out-door Staff.	
1890	48		2,985		£ 52,751		400	
1891	60		3,007		58,900		438	
1892	64		3,112		67,249		548	
1893	67		3,228		82,992		608	
1894	73		3,594		87,496		650	
Dec. 1894	75		3,647		* 99,965		670	
Total in- crease in six years from Dec. 31, 1888 to Dec. 1894	32		1,069		57,569		401	
Average annual in- crease dur- ing last four years of M.B.W.)	13 $\frac{1}{4}$		83 $\frac{1}{2}$		561		15 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Average annual in- crease dur- ing first six years of L.C.C.)	7		178 $\frac{1}{2}$		9,594 $\frac{1}{2}$		66 $\frac{1}{8}$	

\* Estimate.



Here, again, Deptford has received special attention. The South-Eastern district of London has, indeed, profited considerably by the Council's six years' generous dealing in open spaces. Besides improving Southwark Park and the Woolwich Commons, the Council has acquired, at a heavy expense, Bostall Woods, Maryon Park, Peckham Rye Park, and additional land at the Ladywell Recreation Ground. Brockley and Hatcham gain the Hilly Fields and Telegraph Hill, now being carefully laid out.

### Deptford Park.

Finally, thanks to a quite exceptionally generous contribution from the Council, amounting to no less than £24,000, 17 acres of land by Lower Road have been purchased from Mr. Evelyn, and Deptford will soon have a park for its very own.

But the vigour, intelligence and ingenuity of the Council's park administration have been even greater than its success in adding to the open space area. By the wonderfully liberal provision of cricket pitches, football grounds, tennis-courts and gymnasia for girls as well as for boys : by the supply of free public conveniences for both sexes ; by the very successful regulation of the refreshment tariffs ; by the abolition of the charge for chairs ; and, above all, by the plentiful supply of music in the summer months by the Council's own uniformed band, the use and popularity of the Council's parks among the masses has enormously increased. Other classes are no less loud in their praise. Bank clerks are not usually very "advanced" in their political views, but I have been more than once thanked in City banking houses by enthusiastic skaters for the care taken by the Council to promote the greatest possible enjoyment of the ice. The Council, in short, by common consent, has proved itself a wise and successful administrator of London's treasure in open spaces, and, though there is nothing for which money is more liberally voted, it has all been accomplished at an infinitesimal extra cost. The increase of charge in the six years does not amount to a rate of a half-penny in the pound, and comes almost exactly to threepence per head per annum on the whole population. Once in four

months every Londoner is invited, in effect, to "put a penny in the slot" of the Council's money box, and to obtain, in return, nicer walks for his wife and himself, more playing fields for the babies, cricket and football for his boys, a free gymnasium for his girls, and music for the family party.

### How the County Council has protected us against fire.

Second only to the Parks for vigorous growth and successful administration, the Council may be proud of the record of its Fire Brigade. Oddly enough, it is just in this department that the Council has been, ever since the retirement of Sir Eyre Massey Shaw, most bitterly attacked. Many persons suppose that the Council's quarrel with that distinguished dinner-out was due to his insistence, against ignorant and meddlesome opposition, on the efficiency of his department. It is time that the truth should be known. Under Captain Shaw's *regime* the Fire Brigade failed altogether to keep pace with the growing needs of London; the Metropolitan Board of Works, engaged in a futile struggle with the insurance companies, allowed their expenditure on the Fire Brigade amid a rapidly growing population positively to decline; the Superintendent acquiesced, year after year, in an inadequacy which was a standing danger to the Metropolis; and under his lax rule, moreover, there grew up a system of officers accepting presents from contractors and undertaking work for private employers, such as no diligent administrator would have endured and no vigilant committee would have permitted. South East London, and Deptford in particular, specially suffered from neglect. The rapidly growing districts were left without, practically any protection from fire in their own neighbourhoods. The new houses on the Brockley and Dulwich slopes, the quickly developing Manor of Hatcham, and the large new estates in Peckham and Bermondsey were specially in danger. It was high time that a change was made. How great has been the progress since Sir Eyre Massey Shaw threw up his place in disgust at the Council's innovations, the following table will show:

*The Metropolitan Fire Brigade under the Board of Works.*

Year ending 31st Dec.	Author- ised Staff	Land Fire Engine Stati'ns	Hose cart Stati'ns	Fire Escape Stati'ns	Annual Cost
					£
1884	672	55	23	127	119,937
1885	672	55	26	127	117,877
1886	672	55	26	127	115,360
1887	674	55	27	127	112,697
1888	674	55	27	127	119,460
Total increase in four years .. ..)	2	0	4	0	( decrease 477

*The Metropolitan Fire Brigade under the County Council.*

Year ending 31st March.	Author- ised Staff.	Land Fire Engine Stati'ns	Hose Cart Stati'ns	Fire Escape Stati'ns	Annual Cost.
					£
1890	790	55	27	146	120,722
1891	822	55	52	179	122,395
1892	825	55	51	179	128,906
1893	825	55	52	179	128,815
1894	846	56	53	180	143,000
Dec. 1894	909	57	58	198	*149,750
Increase in six years (from Dec. 1888 to Dec. 1894) .. ..)	135	2	31	71	30,290
Average increase dur- ing four years under M.B.W. .. ..)	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	0	( decrease 119 $\frac{1}{2}$
Average increase in six years under L.C.C.	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	6	116	5,054

\* Estimate.



A large share of this increase (including both the new Fire Engine Stations) has come to South East London. The new station at New Cross, a splendid piece of building work, represents a great additional protection against fire for all Deptford.

Along with this increase has gone a no less satisfactory growth in the supply of those ingenious but expensive mechanical contrivances which enable the fireman's hose to be affixed directly to the high-pressure water-mains. When the Council came into existence there were only 8807 of these "hydrants" in all London. At the present time there are 18,711, nearly one-tenth of which are in the district of the Kent Water Company. The result of all this increased efficiency is strikingly demonstrated in the statistics of fires. The total number of outbreaks, which no fire brigade can diminish, goes steadily up. In 1884 there were every day six outbreaks: in 1893, nearly nine. But the proportion of these outbreaks which are allowed to reach any considerable dimensions has, under the Council's rule, steadily fallen. In the five years between 1884 and 1888, when Captain Shaw and the Metropolitan Board of Works were in power, seventy-two out of every 1000 fires grew to such an extent as to be classified as "serious." Between 1889 and 1893, the corresponding portion was only sixty; a reduction of no less than 16 per cent. Ten years ago one-eleventh of the outbreaks became "serious"; to day the proportion is one-twentieth.

### Purchase of the Water Companies.

But the protection of London from fire can never attain perfection so long as four distinct authorities jostle each other at every outbreak. The Council's fire brigade has to secure the co-operation, not only of the Home-Secretary's police and of the insurance companies' "London Salvage Corps," but also of the eight competing water companies. This brings us to a further problem. For over two years the Council's Water Committee has been quietly grappling with its colossal task, the difficulties of which cannot all be publicly stated, and are consequently not realised by impatient reformers outside. Now, at last after much anxious inquiry and deliberation, the com-

mittee sees its labours near fruition in the presentation to Parliament, of eight Bills for the purchase of the water companies' undertakings, on terms equitable alike to the shareholders and the public. During the next few months the battle will be fought in the committee-room of the House of Commons, against all the forensic talent and expert energy which wealth can enrol in the defence of monopoly rights. But the Council has no intention of putting its head helplessly in the lion's mouth. The water companies have been beaten before, and may, in a democratic Parliament, be beaten again. The Thames is not the only, nor even the best, source of London's supply, and when the time comes the Water Committee will show that its prolonged investigations for the protection of the ratepayers have not been thrown away.

### Some other Committees.

I must pass over with a mere mention some of the other committees, whose work, though often less exciting, is no less onerous and important. The Parliamentary Committee, where we have daily and hourly to struggle to safeguard London's interests against the railway and ground landlord monopolists: the Bridges Committee, with its colossal engineering experiment of driving a tunnel under the Thames in compressed air, a great boon to Deptford and Greenwich, now, I am glad to say, more than half completed; the Improvements Committee, struggling with its scanty resources to cope with London's ever growing traffic; the Thames Conservancy (now the Rivers) Committee which has won for London the right to representation on the Thames Conservancy Board, and incidentally revolutionised that anomalous body; the Main Drainage Committee, which has purified the river itself; the Corporate Property Committee, managing the Council's estates, worth over two millions, and keeping up a vigilant scrutiny of all charitable endowments; the Finance Committee, whose administration, praised even by the City and the purists at the Treasury, leaves not a single point for criticism in the Council's financial transactions, and has carried Metropolitan stock up to within a few points of Consols; the Local Government and Taxa-

tion Committee, fighting incessantly to secure a uniform basis of valuation for London, and converting even the local assessment committees to its views; the Public Control Committee, wielding a heterogeneous collection of municipal powers over baby-farms and coal-supply, shop hours and petroleum; the Theatres Committee maintaining the safety and decency of our amusements; the Highways Committee, whose battle for the tramways has put at least a million sterling into the pockets of the London ratepayer; the General Purposes Committee—half revising Cabinet, half “maid of all work” to the others—all these, not to speak of special committees for particular purposes, take their part in the great organisation by which London rules its corporate life.

### Technical Education.

If it be asked what new thing the present Council has done, apart from extending the first Council's work, I think we may with some confidence refer to the starting of its department of Technical Education. The circumstances of London differ so much from those of other cities and counties, the difficulties and complications of its educational problems are so great, the chaos of unco-ordinated authorities is so bewildering, that the first Council may well be excused for not immediately adding Technical Education to all its other duties. But the second Council grappled with the problem in its very first summer. Having been, from the outset, Chairman of the Special Committee and then of the Technical Education Board, to which the Council has delegated its educational functions, I am disqualified from expressing any opinion as to the success of this new departure. But I think it will be admitted that we have made good use of our time. The Technical Education Board, which carries on this part of the Council's work, has already established a comprehensive “scholarship ladder” from the School Board right up to the highest technical college, the best art schools, and the university; it has done much by its liberal grants and skilled inspection to develop and improve the various “Polytechnics” now growing up all over the Metropolis; under the expert guidance of Dr.



Garnett it has worked a beneficent revolution in the evening science and technology classes, and made more practical the instruction in these subjects given in the public secondary schools, whilst the London Schools of Art are, under its fostering care, springing into new life. By the appointment, as its art advisers, of such expert craftsmen as Mr. George Frampton, A.R.A., and Mr. William Lethaby, a distinguished sculptor and a no less distinguished architect, the Board has shown how thoroughly it is alive to the need for a thorough reorganisation of the "arts and crafts" side, and we need not now despair of London one day possessing a Municipal Art School to rival that of Birmingham. Nor have the women and girls been forgotten. Besides sharing in all the preceding advantages, they enjoy a special department of their own. The Board has set up three "Schools of Domestic Economy" (shortly to be increased to five) which intercept the maidens of thirteen who would otherwise be leaving school to "take a little place"; it has started at Battersea a Domestic Economy Training School, which is already turning out skilled teachers accustomed to the house-keeping of the London poor; and, by a permanent staff of qualified instructors in cookery, dressmaking, laundry work and hygiene, it has given thousands of lessons in these subjects to groups of working women in all parts of London, who are too old or too poor, too hard worked or too apathetic to take advantage of any existing institution.

### Deptford has Done Well.

Nothing has given me greater pleasure in my work than the very honourable place which Deptford has taken in this branch. Deptford's proportion of the 721 Junior County Scholarships already awarded should have been about 17, but Deptford boys and girls have gained no fewer than 45. I hardly thought that a Deptford school would have had a chance in our first Intermediate Scholarship Examination, as only 50 of these valuable prizes were given for all London. But Addey's School (which has received this year over £500 aid from the Board), succeeded in winning one of the 35 for boys in

competition with much richer and larger schools from all parts of London, and two Deptford girls were successful among 15 from all London. Finally, one of the very valuable Senior Scholarships, of which only five were given, would certainly have gone to the son of a respected resident of Deptford, who stood in the very first rank among the competitors, had he not in the meantime been awarded a more valuable scholarship from another source. All this reflects great credit on our local schools. Besides John Addey's, of which I have the honour of being a governor, the Board has liberally aided the Aske and Roan Schools, with a view to making the science and art teaching more practical and efficient. And I was glad to see that a Deptford student gained one of the Board's first Art Scholarships, whilst another Deptford man carried off one of the 17 Artisan Art Scholarships. In science, too, Deptford has stood well. The two series of "pioneer" lectures given at Sayes Court were among the most successful of our experiments, and I cherish the hope that they will lead at no distant date to the establishment, in some form or another, of a permanent Technical Institute in North Deptford. Finally, in the domain of Domestic Economy Deptford has at last claimed its share, and is now receiving, I am glad to say, 5 lessons a week in cookery and dressmaking by our own salaried teachers.

### "Trade Union Wages."

But the branch of the Council's work which has attracted the greatest interest has undoubtedly been its labour policy and its establishment of a separate Works Committee. Here the present Council has, in the short space of under three years, done much to settle, by actual experience, some of the most difficult problems of public administration.

Let us take first what is known as the "Fair Wages Movement," which was, for several years, constantly made a ground of ridicule and denunciation by the Council's critics. Seldom has a policy so bitterly abused been so quickly and triumphantly successful. After prolonged

discussion, repeated at intervals during four years, it has become settled policy to pay, in each trade, the recognised trade union rate of wages, and in no case less than 6d. an hour to adult men, or 18s. a week to adult women. At first this was thought a dreadful business. Many persons unfamiliar with the actual practice of industrial life imagined that the common phrase, "Trade union wages," involved something quite new in wage adjustments, and meant just whatever the trade unions might choose to ask for. What was proposed, and what has been done, is the insertion, in the Council's own standard list of wages of the rates proved, after exhaustive inquiry, to be actually recognised and adopted by the leading employers in each particular trade within the London district. In the whole of the building trades, for instance, which comprise three-fourths of the Council's work, the trade union rates of wages were found embodied in an elaborate formal treaty concluded between the London Master Builders' Association and the London Building Trades' Federation.

With regard to unskilled labour the case is otherwise. Here, in most cases, no generally recognised trade union rate exists. The Council, fortified by a unanimous vote of the House of Commons to the same effect, has taken the position that it is undesirable, whatever the competition, that any of its employees should receive less than the minimum required for efficient and decent existence. Seeing that Mr. Charles Booth places the actual "poverty line" in London at regular earnings of 21s. per week, it cannot be said that the Council's "moral minimum" of 24s. for men and 18s. for women errs on the side of luxury or extravagance. I wish the Admiralty (whom we have induced to raise the minimum wage in the Victualling Yard from 17s. to 20s.) would follow the Council's example. I am convinced that it would result in a great improvement in North Deptford.

### A Wise and Economical Policy.

The principle involved in this policy is easily stated. Public offices may be filled in one or two ways. We may, on the one hand, practically put the places up to auction, taking those candidates who offer to do the work for the

lowest wage. Or, on the other hand, we may first fix the emoluments, and then pick the best of the candidates coming forward on those terms. When we want brain-workers of any kind, every one agrees that the latter policy is the only safe one. We do not appoint as a judge the lawyer who offers to take the place at the lowest rate. No one would think of inviting competitive tenders from engineers or doctors as to the price at which they would fill a vacant post. In all these cases we have learnt, by long and painful experience, that there is so much difference between competence and incompetence, that we do not dream of seeking to save money by taking the candidate who offers his services at the lowest rate. Unfortunately, many worthy people who realise this aspect of brainwork, because they belong themselves to the brainworking class, are unconscious that it applies no less forcibly to mechanical labour. They will pay any price for a good architect, but are apt to regard bricklayers and masons as all equally "common workmen." The consequence is that, owing to the extraordinary ignorance of the middle and upper class about the actual life of the handicraft trades, it has gradually become accepted as good business that, though you must take all possible trouble in choosing your manager, it is safe and right to buy wage-labour at the lowest market rates. But, as a matter of fact, there is as great a relative difference between one painter or plasterer and another, as there is between one architect or manager and another. If the pressure of competition is shifted from the plane of quality to the plane of cheapness, all economic experience tells us that the result is incompetency, scamped work, the steady demoralisation of the craftsman, and all the degradation of sweating. When a man engages a coachman or a gardener, he understands this well enough, and never for a moment thinks of hiring the cheapest who presents himself. Even the sharpest pressed employer does not entrust expensive machinery to the mechanic who offers to take the least wages. The London County Council, realising it more vividly than some bodies less in touch with the actual facts of industrial life, applies the principle all round. Whether the post to be filled be that of an architect or a carpenter, the wage to



be paid is first fixed at a rate sufficient to attract the best class of men in the particular occupation. Then the most competent candidate that can be found is chosen. Competition among the candidates works no less keenly than before ; but it is competition tending not to reduce the price, thereby lowering the standard of life throughout the nation, but to enhance efficiency, and thus really to lessen the cost of production.

### Raising the Standard of Life.

With regard to the lowlier grades of labour a further consideration enters in. It may be economically permissible, under the present organisation of industry, for a private employer to pay wages upon which, as he perfectly well knows, it is impossible for the worker to maintain himself or herself in efficiency. But when a Board of Poor Law Guardians finds itself rescuing from starvation, out of the Poor Rate, women actually employed by one of its own contractors to make up workhouse clothing at wages insufficient to keep body and soul together, even the most rigorous economist would admit that something was wrong. The London County Council, responsible as it is for the health of the people of London, declines to use its position as an employer deliberately to degrade that health by paying wages obviously and flagrantly insufficient for maintenance, even if competition drives down rates to that pitch.

It must equally be put to the credit of the present Council that it has settled the "Fair Wages" question for its contractors as well as for itself. Many town councils up and down the country are still labouring with this issue, which London has at last got rid of. All firms tendering for the Council's work are required to specify the wages they pay for each particular craft. If the work is to be executed within the London district, it is an easy matter to see whether these rates correspond with those in the Council's Standard List. If the work is to be done elsewhere, it is found, in practice, quite possible to ascertain, by inquiry of the proper local officers of the associations of employers on the one hand and the trade unions on the other, whether the proposed rates are really those current

in the district. Firms accusing themselves of paying less than these rates are informed of the fact, as a reason why their tenders are not accepted, and have, therefore, full opportunity of correcting any injustice. This system works smoothly and well. The good contractors fall easily into line with it, and most of the minority of Councillors who honestly believed it to be impossible of execution, now recognise that they were mistaken. Here, again the key-note of the Council's policy is, not the abolition of competition, but the shifting of its plane from mere cheapness to that of industrial efficiency. The speeding up of machinery, the better organisation of labour, the greater competency of manager, clerk or craftsman, are all stimulated and encouraged by the deliberate closing-up to the contractor of less legitimate means of making profit. Just as the Factory Acts, the Mines Regulation Acts, and the Education Acts "rule out" of industrial competition the cheapness brought about by the overwork of women and children, or the neglect of sanitary precautions, so the London County Council, representing the people of London, declines to take advantage of any cheapness that is got by merely beating down the standard of life of particular sections of the wage earners. And just as the Factory Acts have won their way to economic approval, not merely on humanitarian grounds, but as positively conducive to industrial efficiency, so, too, it may confidently be predicted, will the now widely-adopted fair wages clauses.\*

### The Works Department.

We come to an altogether different range of criticism when we consider the Council's determination to dispense wherever possible, with the contractor, and execute its works by engaging a staff of workmen under the supervision of its own salaried officers. This has been fiercely attacked as being palpably and obviously opposed to political economy and business experience. It is worth while to place on record the facts. The first case is that

\* Over 150 local governing bodies have adopted some kind of fair wages clause in their contracts (*see* H. C. 189, of 1892); compare also, the House of Commons' unanimous resolutions of February 13, 1891, and March 6, 1893 imposing the principle for Government contracts.

of watering and cleaning the bridges over the Thames, a service which the Metropolitan Board of Works let out to a contractor. The new Council perversely went into calculations which led the members to believe that the contractor was making a very good thing out of the job, and finally to decide upon engaging labour direct. There have now been over three years' experience of the new system, with the result that, whereas the contractor charged 4s. 7½d. to 4s. 10d.+ per square yard, the work is now done at an average cost of 3s. 2d. a square yard, everything included.

This, however, was merely a matter of hiring labour, no constructive work being involved. It is interesting to trace the stages by which the Council was driven, by force of circumstances, to its present position of builder. The first piece of actual building executed by the Council was the schoolhouse at Crossness. The architect's estimate was for £1,800, and tenders were invited in due course. The lowest tender proved to be £2,300. After considerable hesitation the Main Drainage Committee resolved to try to save this large excess over the estimate, and set to work to do the job under its own officers. The result was the completion of the work for less than the architects estimate, and for £536 less than the lowest tender. But the case which finally convinced three out of every four members of the Council of the desirability of executing their own works was the York Road Sewer. The engineer estimated the cost at £7,000, and tenders were invited in the usual manner. Only two were sent in, one for £11,588, and the other for £11,608. The Council determined to do the work itself, with the result that a net saving of £4,477 was made.†

### How the Contractors tried to Corner the Council.

This remarkable result naturally created a sensation among the contracting world, and attempts were made to impugn the engineer's figures. In his crushing reply he pointed out that the contractors had reckoned out their tenders at absurdly high prices in nearly every detail,

charging, for instance, 60s. and 70s. respectively, per cubic yard of brickwork and cement, whereas the work was done at 39s. It is clear from the other particulars given, and from facts notorious at the time, that an agreement had been come to by the contractors not to compete with one another for this job, in order to induce the Council to abandon the fair wages clause. The Council preferred to abandon the contractor.\*

The outcome was the establishment, in the spring of 1893, of a Works Committee to execute works required by other committees in precisely the same manner as a contractor. The Works Committee has an entirely distinct staff, and keeps its own separate accounts. The committee requiring any work prepares its own estimate, as if tenders were going to be invited, and the Works Committee is asked whether it is prepared to undertake the work upon that estimate.

### A Net Saving to the Ratepayers.

Up to the present time the Works Committee has completed and rendered accounts for twenty-nine separate jobs, varying from £100 to £18,785. Sometimes the expenditure works out below the estimate, sometimes above. I dare say that we shall hear a great deal about the fact that the New Cross Fire Station—a magnificent specimen of bricklayer's craft, executed under great difficulties—cost somewhat more than the estimate. On the other hand the equally excellent foundations for the Hughes Fields Cottages cost far less than the estimate. In the aggregate the total cost of these twenty-nine works—undertaken at the very outset of a new business, with insufficient plant and under manifold disadvantages—comes to the very satisfactory figure of £63,045, against the architect's and engineer's detailed and independent prior estimates, amounting to £66,142. The total result shows therefore a net saving to the ratepayers.

It is often taken for granted that the Council's policy of eliminating the contractor is an unparalleled innovation, unknown outside London. A little knowledge of the

\* *Minutes*, 17th October,



action of local governing bodies elsewhere would prevent this mistake. To take, for instance, the Town Council of Birmingham, which, being run strictly on business principles, is held up by Mr. Chamberlain as a pattern and a model to London. It is, of course, unnecessary to remind the reader that Birmingham has municipalised its water and its gas, which are in London still left to private enterprise. What is not so well known is that the Town Council of Birmingham is by no means enamoured of the contractor, and that it dispenses with him whenever it can. The Public Works Committee, which looks after the thoroughfares, and the Health Committee, which is responsible for sanitation, have not only entirely eliminated the contractor from the cleaning and repairing of the streets and the removal of the refuse, but even from the laying down of granite paving and flagging, once a most profitable item of his business. The Gas Committee is not content with employing hundreds of men to make gas, but also keeps its own staff of carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, tinmen, painters, fitters, &c., to execute its numerous works. The Improvements Committee, like the Estates Committee, has its own carpenters and fitters, bricklayers and paper hangers, plasterers and zineworkers\* whilst the Water Committee, besides a regular staff of mechanics of all kinds, is now actually engaged in constructing several huge dams and reservoirs near Rhayader, two tunnels and various water towers and syphons, together with workmen's dwellings to accommodate a thousand people, stables, stores, workshops, a public hall and recreation room, a school, and two hospitals—all without the intervention of a contractor. "The construction of all the buildings on the works is being carried out by the workmen of the Corporation, under the superintendence of the resident engineer and his assistant. The timber and other material is being purchased by tender. This method," reports the Water Committee, "of using material supplied by contract, and constructing by the direct employees of the Corporation, the

\* Return of Hours of Labour, Wages, &c. Appendix to Birmingham General Purposes Committee's Report, July 25 (1893).

Committee consider, under the circumstances of the case, to be the most economical, as well as calculated to secure the best results." But this is not all. The Water Committee, finding that the village would have beer, has decided also in this matter to dispense with any *entrepreneur*, and has "resolved that a canteen shall be established in the village " out of the capital of the Birmingham citizens, and "that the person managing it shall have no interest whatever in the quantity sold." †

### How the Contractors did the Work.

And if we turn to Liverpool we learn that "almost all the city engineer's work is done by men directly employed by the Corporation. . . . The construction of sewers is now done entirely by the Corporation themselves. . . . They had such a cruel experience of doing the work of sewerage by contractors that they have given it up." \* It appears that in the old days, when the contractor agreed and charged for two courses of brickwork, no amount of inspection sufficed to prevent him putting in one only. "What happened was this, that whenever the inspector came round, or the clerk of the works, to watch the contractors, they found the two rings of brickwork going on very well; as soon as the inspector went away . . . the second ring of brickwork was left out . . . and so the sewer got weak. . . . You could trace the visits of the inspector by the double rings" which were found here and there at intervals when the sewers were subsequently uncovered for repairs. †

It is, therefore, no wonder that, when the Liverpool Town Council undertook its great Vyrnwy dam and waterworks, this, like its sewerage, scavengering, and cleaning, was done by directly employed labour.

Nor is it in municipal boroughs alone that we see the change in policy. Nothing was more common a few years

† Report of the Birmingham Water Committee, presented February 6, 1894.

\* "Evidence of the Deputy Town Clerk of Liverpool before the Unification of London Commission," p. 328 of c. 7493-1.

† *Ib d.* p. 328.

ago than for highway authorities to get their roads kept in order by contractors. An interesting return obtained in 1892 by the County Surveyors' Society shows that this practice has been almost entirely abandoned in favour of direct employment of labour by the county surveyor. Only in one or two counties out of thirty-five furnishing particulars does the old custom linger. 'The county surveyor of Gloucestershire indignantly denied an allegation that he favoured the contract system. "It does not commend itself to me in any way," he writes, "and encourages a low form of sweating. My own experience of road-contracting is that it does very well for five years, then the roads go to pieces, and you have to spend all your previous savings to put them to rights."†

When we thus find even rural districts giving up the contractor, it ceases to be surprising that the Town Council of Manchester now manufactures its own bass-brooms, or even that the ultra-conservative Commissioners of Sewers of the City of London actually set the County Council an example by manufacturing their own waggons, harness, and horse shoes, all, as they proudly declare, "by their own staff."§ The superiority of direct municipal employment, under salaried supervision, to the system of letting out works to contractors has, in fact, been slowly borne in on the best municipal authorities all over the country by their own administrative experience, quite irrespective of social or political theories.

All this time the impatient ratepayer, hard pressed on all sides, may perhaps have been thinking ruefully of the heavy burden which the Council's vigorous activity must have laid on his shoulders. I have no doubt, indeed, that at the coming election we shall hear a great many reckless assertions about the rise in the Council's rate. Nothing is easier than to point out that the Council's precept for 1894-5 has been for 1s. 2d. in the pound, whilst the last precept of the Metropolitan Board of Works in

† "Particulars of Management of Main Roads in England and Wales," a report copied from the County Surveyors' Society, by Mr. Heslop, County Surveyor for Norfolk. See *Builder*, March 19 and 26, 1892.

§ Statement of the Commissioners of Sewers, presented to the Royal Commission on London Unification, p. 171 of c. 7493 ii.

1888-9 was only for 10 1-6d. But these two figures can no more be fairly placed in comparison than the house-keeping budget of a lone woman with that of the mother of a large and growing family. The Council's precept includes not only the old charges of the Metropolitan Board of Works, but also several other rates which used formerly to be levied in other ways. The Deptford ratepayer used, for instance, to pay the County Justices' Rate, which, in 1888-9, the last year of its separate existence, came, for Kent, to 4d. in the pound. In Middlesex it was 1·25d., and in Surrey 1·375d. in the pound. This is now included in the Council's precept. Spread over all London, instead of over the three counties, these charges come to 1·73d. in the pound, so that the Deptford ratepayer (outside the Manor of Hatcham) *saves over twopence farthing in the pound* by paying to the London County Council, instead of, as formerly, to the Justices of Kent.

### How Deptford has had its Rates Reduced.

Then there are the portions of the old Poor Rate and General Vestry Rate which have been, for the sake of greater efficiency and better equalisation of the burden, placed on the broad shoulders of the County Council. These items, which the Council actually pays out to the local Vestries and Boards of Guardians, and which do not form part of the Council's own expenditure at all, amount to 3·72d. of the Council's precept. But Deptford gets more than an average share. The Council pays over this year to the Greenwich Board of Guardians (who act for the parish of Deptford) an amount equal to 5·39d. in the pound of the parish rates, besides ·07d. in the pound to the Greenwich District Board of Works. If we add these grants (average 3·72d.), and the old County Justices' Rate (average 1·73d.) to the last precept of the Metropolitan Board of Works (10·16d.), we shall see that, instead of 14d. representing an increased charge on the London ratepayer, there is a positive decrease of 1·61d. (over three halfpence) in the pound. This paradoxical result is due, of course, to the operation of Mr. Goschen's exchequer contribution arrangements, by which the County Council was made the recipient of the national subvention in aid



of the rates, and directed to contribute a certain part of it to the local authorities. The Council's contributions were, by Mr. Ritchie's praiseworthy ingenuity, made so as to operate unequally as between different parishes in such a way that the poorer districts benefit, whilst the richer lose by the change. The result is that in Deptford, as in the majority of the London parishes, the net demand of the County Council is *far less than was formerly paid to the Metropolitan Board of Works and the County Justices, and it has positively decreased during the six years of the Council's existence.* I well remember the surprise of the gentlemen who, at the last election, were chosen to oppose me in the "Moderate" interest, on finding that the Council, instead of increasing the rates, had, in Deptford, actually lowered them. In 1889-90, the last year for which the Metropolitan Board of Works framed the Estimate, the total rates in Deptford amounted to 6s. in the pound. Since then the Deptford rates have, in spite of an increase in the parish expenditure, never been higher than 6s., and have usually been lower. Here are the figures up to date :—  
*Total Rates in the pound levied in the Parish of St. Paul, Deptford, in each of the years 1889-90 to 1893-4 inclusive.*

1889-90	1890-91	1891-92	1892-93	1893-94
6s. 0d.	5s. 10d.	5s. 10d.	5s. 8d.	6s. 0d.

I am glad to think that the Council has now secured a further reduction of the burden for the Deptford rate-payers. By dint of very great pressure on the Government and Parliament, we were able to get the Equalisation of Rates Act passed last session, under which the Council is now already beginning to levy £228,000 per annum on the richer City and West End parishes, in order to pay it over to the poorer ones. Deptford's share of this sum, half of which will be payable this very quarter, is £7,443 a year, equal to a *further reduction in the Deptford rates of no less than 3 3-5d. in the pound.*

## Rates Lower by Ninepence-halfpenny in the Pound.

As far as Deptford is concerned, therefore, the County Council, far from increasing the rates, has positively lowered them. If there had been no County Council and no Progressive majority, and if things had gone on just as they were in 1888-9, the Deptford ratepayer would have been paying to the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Justices of Kent and Surrey at least a farthing in the pound *more* than he now pays to the County Council, whilst the Greenwich Board of Guardians and the Greenwich District Board would have to do without the very handsome subsidy of  $5\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound which they already receive from the County Council, and the further subsidy of 3 3-5d. in the pound which they will receive under the Equalisation of Rates Act. The total result to the Deptford ratepayer is, therefore, that he will this year be paying altogether  $9\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound *less* than he would have done had the Council not come into existence, and had none of these changes been made. In the City and the West End, where the ratepayer formerly got off with 3s. 6d. to 4s. in the pound for all his rates (as against 5s. 6d. to 6s. in Deptford), he has now to pay 6d. to 1s. more than he formerly did. I think you will now easily understand why the City and West End hate the County Council so fiercely, and if gentlemen come to Deptford to denounce the Progressive Party, I hope you will remember that they probably live in rich parishes which have had to pay more, in order that Deptford and other poor parishes might pay less.

I do not mean that the Council spends less money than the Metropolitan Board of Works, although (by better distribution of the burden) it costs less to Deptford. On the whole, taking the average throughout London, the Council's net demand on the London ratepayer has, in the six years of its existence, risen by  $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound, everything included. This increase will, I suppose, be regarded with different eyes by different classes. To me, I confess, it is a standing marvel how so much can have been done for so little. A halfpenny for the Parks Committee, a halfpenny for the Technical Education Board, a farthing

for the increase in the Fire Brigade, and another farthing to cover the growing activities of the Public Health, Main Drainage, and other committees—this is the price, which London, as a whole, is asked to pay for the beneficent revolution which has taken place in every department of its municipal life between 1889 and 1895.

### What the Council has to Show for the Money.

In those six years over 1,000 acres have been added to its open spaces, over 20 per cent to its fire-watch; a vast, though incalculable, advance has been made in its sanitation; the Thames has been so far purified that whitebait is once more caught where sewage lately floated up and down with every tide; great strides have been taken towards the better housing of the London poor; one huge common lodging-house has been open for the homeless men, and every slum landlord is complaining at the expenditure to which he is now put for improvements and repairs. The reign of the contractor, with its "rings" and "knock-outs," has been brought to an end, and trade union wages, with a "moral minimum," have been established in every department of the Council's service. Nor has the Council stayed its hand in those improvements in the means of communication which are among the first needs of a growing city. The gigantic engineering experiment of a new Thames Tunnel, begun in 1890, is already more than half completed, whilst innumerable minor street improvements has been carried out. Finally, during the last eighteen months, 800 of our most promising boys and girls have been started up the "Scholarship Ladder" of the Technical Education Board, and thousands of their elder brothers and sisters have been swept into evening classes. For all this the total cost of London come to  $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound, and *this is paid entirely by the richer parishes.*

When I asked for your votes three years ago, it was on the ground that something could be done by the Council to raise the standard of life among the most down-trodden of our fellow citizens. I have tried in these pages to report the work that has been done for the improvement of London—done amid many difficulties by much anxious

thought and care. It is not so much as I could have wished, but it is a beginning. We have sought to make London a brighter and a healthier, and, therefore, a soberer and a happier city. It is now for the electors to say whether we are to go on with our task.

SIDNEY WEBB.



"A MASTERLY PIECE OF WORK."—*Times*.

---

Now Ready, Post 8vo. 574 pp., cloth, with Coloured Map, 18s

THE

# History of Trade Unionism.

BY

SIDNEY AND BEATRICE WEBB.

---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS work, the result of three years' special investigation, describes the growth and development of the Trade Union Movement in the United Kingdom from 1700 down to the present day. Founded almost entirely upon material hitherto unpublished, it is not a mere chronicle of Trade Union organisation or record of strikes, but gives, in effect, the political history of the English working-class during the last 150 years. The opening chapter describes the handicraftsman in the toils of the industrial revolution, striving vainly to retain the mediæval regulation of his standard of life. In subsequent chapters the Place Manuscripts and the Archives of the Privy Council and the Home Office enable the authors to picture the struggles of the early Trade Unionists against the Combination Laws, and the remarkable Parliamentary manipulation which led to their repeal. The private records of the various societies, together with contemporary pamphlets and working-class newspapers furnish a graphic account of the hitherto undescribed outburst of "New Unionism" of 1830-34, with its revolutionary aims and subsequent Chartist entanglements. In the course of the narrative we see the intervention in Trade Union history of FRANCIS PLACE, JOSEPH HUME, J. R. McCULLOCH, NASSAU SENIOR, WILLIAM THE FOURTH, LORD MELBOURNE, ROBERT OWEN, FERGUS O'CONNOR, THOMAS SLINGSBY DUNCOMBE, JOHN BRIGHT, JOHN STUART MILL, the Christian Socialists, the Positivists, and many living politicians. The hidden influence of Trade Unionism on English politics is traced from point to point, new light being incidentally thrown upon the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1874. A detailed analysis is given of the economic and political causes which have, since 1880, transformed Trade Unionism from an Individualist to a Collectivist force. The final chapter describes the Trade Union world of to-day in all its varied features, including a realistic sketch of Trade Union life by a Trade Union Secretary, and a classified census founded on the authors' investigations into a thousand separate unions in all parts of the country. A colored map represents the percentage which the Trade Unionists bear to the population of each county. A bibliography of Trade Union Literature is appended.

---

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO., LONDON and NEW YORK

THEO. MAY, Trade Union Printer, 138 Tanner's Hill, Deptford, S.E

